

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending. Claims 1-38 are rejected. Claims 1-5 and 7-38 have been canceled in this Request for Continued Examination.

In the Final Office Action dated September 6, 2007, claims 6-8, 10, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishra et al. "Security Services Markup Language" ("Mishra") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 to Gupta et al. ("Gupta"). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishra in view of Gupta as applied to claims 6-8, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029269 to McCarty et al. ("McCarty").

Applicants' invention relates to a method for providing a single-sign-on mechanism within an ASP aggregator service. Independent claim 6 recites the limitation of an aggregator token that is generated by an ASP aggregator service and sent to a client device after its user has been successfully authenticated during a single-sign-on operation that is provided by the ASP aggregator service. The aggregator token then accompanies any request from the client to aggregated applications within the ASP aggregator service's infrastructure. In the embodiment of the invention recited in independent claim 6, the aggregator token comprises an indication of an address or resource identifier within the ASP aggregator service to which a client/user can be redirected when the client/user needs to be authenticated by the ASP aggregator service.

Independent claim 6 has been amended to incorporate the limitations previously recited in dependent claims 7-10 and 12. In addition, independent claim 6 has been amended to recite that the ASP is operable to pull authentication information from an aggregator using tokens that have been presented by the client to the ASP. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph [0058] of the specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of prior art references cited by Examiner do not disclose the combination of features cited in independent claim 6, as amended. For the reasons set forth above, therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of independent claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome and this claim should be passed to allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 512-338-9100.

FILED ELECTRONICALLY
March 31, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Gary W. Hamilton/

Gary W. Hamilton
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 31,834